

EPA Air Toxics Pilot Working Group
Meeting Summary
January 28, 2002

Members Attending: Kathleen Gaiser, Bob Leidich, Tom McCleary, Bill Skowronski, Laura Hobson, Anjali Mathur, Marcia Smith, Mary Smith, Bill Davis, Paige Akins, Emily Lee, Amy Simpson, Timothy Neiberding, Mike Suver, Stuart Greenberg, Doug Broussard, Glenn Landers, Joe Calabrese.

Members Absent: Virginia Aveni, Reverend Smith, Reverend Hockett, Jerome Walcott, Mandie Domanovic, Eleanor Bycoski, Kyle Dreyfuss-Wells, Hollie Dellisanti, Elizabeth Shaw, Richard King, Dennis Finn.

Facilitators: Patrick Field, Sanda Kaufman, and Allison Berland

Decisions Made

Number	Decision	Cost
#12	Household Air Toxics Source Reduction	\$13,000

The Ohio Air Toxics Working Group convened for the seventh time at the Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University. The facilitators began by reviewing the agenda and noted that they would be preparing this meeting summary. The facilitators introduced some new people to the Working Group: Reverend Frank and Doug Broussard, who was sitting in for Mike Krzywicki, and Marcia Smith, who will be serving as Jacquie Gillon's alternate.

Review December Meeting Summary

The facilitators reviewed the status of the December meeting summary. The Working Group had no questions or concerns, and the summary was approved.

Home Subcommittee Project Recommendation

Emily Lee, subcommittee coordinator, presented a project proposal to the Working Group. The project targets Household Air Toxics Source Reduction through a neighborhood hazardous waste drop-off, an exchange for less-polluting alternative products such as gas cans, and educational outreach on household air toxics sources. The drop-off is tentatively scheduled for May 10, 2002, which is one week before the county event.

Members posed the following questions about the project:

- Has the Working Group considered asking the city to ban mercury thermometers? Emily: We'll consider this as an option for the subcommittee's final recommendations.
- It sounds like we already have gas cans covered in the transportation budget, so we can eliminate this from the home project budget. Emily: yes that's right, the cost of the cans will be covered through the Transportation budget already approved.
- Why is the transportation budget for gas cans as much as \$24K? Anne Marie: The \$25,000 is a conservative estimate of cost. We chose to use the number of 5000 households, which would be about half the households in both neighborhoods. We may not be able to distribute that many over the life of the project.
- The facilitator reviewed the information about the projects approved in the previous meeting. If the Working Group decides to approve this project, this will put the total budget for projects at about \$93,000.
- One Working Group member asked what is the current standing on project budgets and if the group had agreed to an overall cap for the initial projects. The facilitator noted that the Working Group had set a cap at \$25,000 per budget but had not set a total cap and members confirmed this was the agreement.

After further deliberation, by consensus, the group approved \$13,000 for this project for the Home Subcommittee.

Discussion of Public Outreach for the Pilot

The facilitators stated the conversation by noting that public outreach could serve many functions: it can promote sustainability, education and citizen participation. The group then spent time reviewing the draft "Framework for Thinking about Outreach and Communication."

Sanda Kauffman asked the Working Group what benefits they thought would be achieved from outreach and communication. Members had the following comments:

- Visibility increases credibility
- Raises public awareness
- Provides education about what air toxics are
- By seeing real projects, people can visualize a solution to a problem and realize they can do something themselves to improve air quality
- An educated public is a more informed public.

Pat Field asked the Working Group what audiences they want to reach out to. Members had the following comments:

- | | |
|---|---|
| • Churches -- they are the central point of a community | • Trade Associations |
| • Schools, need to get kids excited about air toxics | • Business and trade press |
| • Radio, TV and print | • Utility companies-to put a flier bills |
| | • Cleveland Housing Network |
| | • Business Groups like Cleveland Tomorrow |

- Medical community -- underserved community trusts this group
- Small newspapers
- Businesses, especially the decision-makers
- TV Channels
- Library Board
- Neighborhood Centers
- EarthFest – on April 21
- Realtors in Cleveland
- African-American museum
- Parent-teacher association
- Parent Leadership Academy
- Cuyahoga County Human Services
- Web Page link from district offices
- Outreach nationally
- Local Sports Makers
- Drug and grocery stores

Sanda Kauffman asked the Working Group what messages they want to send. Members had the following comments:

- The link between air toxics and public health
- Why this project is being done in these two neighborhoods
- Macroeconomic impact of air toxics
- Address what individuals are directly experiencing in terms of air toxics
- How these projects can help a person put their concerns into perspective
- Show what Cleveland did; show that it is possible to do something
- Citizens can take action and do something
- Communicate the results of the project

One member commented that the Working Group should contact the Mayor. Another Working Group member commented that this pilot should be put in context of the larger context – this is a voluntary program, but there are also rules, regulations, and monitoring and enforcement that collectively should help to ensure and improve air quality.

Pat Field asked the Working Group what tools would be most useful in getting the above messages out. Members had the following suggestions and comments:

- Logo for project
- Neighborhood website links
- Media events
- Banners with a logo on it
- Curriculum materials, lesson plans for high school students
- Stamp a product with a logo
- Magnet with something saying, “Here is what you can do in your home”
- Train the trainer for community groups
- Work with meteorologist, part of their weather program
- Commercials, public service announcement
- Buses, “March 4 Cleveland”
- Brochure to hand out at various events
- Poster contest for kids -- the winner would be our poster child
- Essay Contest
- Kite flying contest
- Camp Forbes for Kids
- Metroparks program
- Health fair-could put a booth up.
- Presentation slides members could use to give presentations to community groups

The facilitators asked the Working Group how they would like to implement these public outreach ideas. One member suggested developing a timeline, to focus on what the Working

Group could do and when. One member offered to help write a commercial and/or radio spot. Another member suggested that it makes sense that some of this work be done at the subcommittee level. Mary Smith from the EPA noted that the internal review process for a logo should be somewhat easy. If the logo has the EPA's name on it, then the EPA will have to approve it. If the logo says, "funded by the EPA," then the Working Group probably won't need approval.

One member asked if the Working Group should do an advertising firm to develop a message, or does EPA have the resources? The EPA noted that they do have a lot of communications specialists. Another Working Group members replied that this pilot probably doesn't have the resources for paying for advertising.

One member commented that it was important to note that real differences of opinion exist in this Working Group and that these differences should not be submerged in the process of public outreach. Rather, those issues should be aired and acknowledged openly. One member asked about the groundrules for speaking to the community on behalf of the Working Group. The facilitator noted that the groundrules say if a member speaks about the group, then the member speaks for themselves, not for the group. One member made note that it is important for members to not speak for others, but to clearly speak for themselves so as not to place any member organization in an awkward position of having to deny or contradict a statement about the "group decided X" or the "group thinks Y."

EPA noted that it is important to send a clear and consistent message about the group. She said that the Working Group could produce draft Powerpoint slides for members to use to present to various community groups. One member said that simplicity is important and thought that a logo would be a good idea. Another member noted that the brochure is important because it can be used at many different events

The facilitators helped bring the discussion to a close and suggested that the group hold an ad hoc meeting to further formulate an outreach plan.

Update on Long-Term Funding Mechanism for Projects

EPA's member updated the Working Group about options for a funding mechanism for the pilot. Mary noted that she had talked with several organizations about the possibility of being a direct recipient of funds for the pilot, but had not been able to identify any one organization that best fit the needs of the project and was willing to serve in this role. She reviewed three options for funding projects:

1. Identify one suitable organization to be the sole direct funding-recipient who would in turn distribute the monies.
2. Issue an RFP to solicit organizations that would be interested in taking on this role. In this case, any organization could bid on this, both non-profit and government agency.
3. EPA fund projects on a case-by-case basis through existing mechanisms.

EPA noted that the agency needs to retain the decision about selecting the best funding mechanism, but she would like any input on this decision members have. The facilitators reviewed the above options and noted that if anyone has specific thoughts about this issue to email EPA.

Scheduling Next Meeting

One member inquired about how the agenda is established and noted that the time spent on public outreach could have been shortened and time given to how the group will make decisions. The facilitator said that a draft agenda is sent out to the Working Group by email asking for comments but that this might not be clear enough and the facilitators would find a way to highlight this kind of email.

One member emphasized that the Working Group needs to have a strategic way to review projects as a group. The group needs to have strategic criteria to prioritize projects and be clear about their decisionmaking process before diving in. The group agreed that this would be a key agenda item for next meeting.

The facilitators polled the Working Group on possible dates for the February meeting and suggested February 26, 2002 at 6:00 PM for the next full working group meeting. The facilitators noted that subcommittees might choose to meet on Monday night or on Tuesday.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m. Please note that EPA's website for this pilot is at <http://www.epa.gov/cleveland/>